Reply to Office Action of September 27, 2005 Attorney Docket: 42390.P12248

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-29 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 9, 11, 16, 18, 23, and 25 have been amended. Applicants believe that this response addresses the Examiner's rejection and that any changes do not introduce new matter into the specification, limit the scope of the claims or result in any prosecution history estoppel.

CLAIM REJECTIONS:

35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-29

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-29 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pawlowski et al. (Pub. No. US20010037426; "Pawlowski") in view of Miller (US Patent 6,604,161). Applicants assert that independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 23, as currently amended, recite limitations that are not disclosed or suggested by Pawlowski or Miller, taken either alone or in combination.

Specifically, applicants assert that Pawlowski and/or Miller fail to disclose or suggest a register of bits, each interrupt source corresponding with one bit as recited in claim 1. Claims 9, 16, and 23 recite similar limitations. In the Office Action of September 27, 2005 (the "Office Action"), the Examiner has asserted that Pawlowski's paragraphs 42 and 56 disclose a register of bits, each interrupt source corresponding with one bit as claimed. [Office Action; pages 4-5]. However, applicants note that in the cited portions Pawlowski discusses a "pend int register 420" [Pawlowski; paragraphs 42 and 56] and that Pawlowski clearly discloses that "pend int register 420 comprises 32 bits representing 32 possible interrupts generated by as many as four I/O devices." [Pawlowski; paragraph 34].

Thus, Pawlowski fails to disclose or suggest a register of bits, each interrupt source corresponding with one bit as claimed and Miller fails to correct this deficiency in Pawlowski. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner has failed to sustain a prima facie rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) and that all claims currently pending are in condition for allowance.

Application No. 10/007,472 Reply to Office Action of September 27, 2005 Attorney Docket: 42390,P12248

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that all of the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance.

Should it be determined that an additional fee is due under 37 CFR §§1.16 or 1.17, or any excess fee has been received, please charge that fee or credit the amount of overcharge to deposit account #02-2666.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 264-6473.

Reconsideration of this patent application and early allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert D. Hinchliffe

Patent Attorney Intel Corporation Reg. No. 55,268

Dated: December 21, 2005

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP 1925 NW AmberGlen Parkway, Suite 230 Beaverton, OR 97006 (503) 439-8778

> I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

anabaa ni

Date of Deposit

ame of Rerson Mailing Correspondence

Signature

Dete